

Remarks on the McKay Conjecture

Geoffrey Mason*

Department of Mathematics
University of California at Santa Cruz
Ca. 95064, USA
gem@cats.ucsc.edu

Abstract

The McKay Conjecture (MC) asserts the existence of a bijection between the (inequivalent) complex irreducible representations of degree coprime to p (p a prime) of a finite group G and those of the subgroup N , the normalizer of Sylow p -subgroup. In this paper we observe that MC implies the existence of analogous bijections involving various pairs of algebras, including certain crossed products, and that MC is *equivalent* to the analogous statement for (twisted) quantum doubles. Using standard conjectures in orbifold conformal field theory, MC is *equivalent* to parallel statements about holomorphic orbifolds V^G, V^N . There is a uniform formulation of MC covering these different situations which involves quantum dimensions of objects in pairs of ribbon fusion categories.

Keywords: McKay correspondence, quantum double.

MSC: 20C05.

1 Introduction

The following notation will be fixed throughout the paper: G is a finite group, p a prime, P a Sylow p -subgroup of G , $N = N(P)$ the *normalizer* of P in G , X a (finite, non-empty, left-) G -set. All algebras and modules are finite-dimensional and defined over $\mathbb{C}$. $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is the group algebra of G and $\mathbb{C}[G]^*$ the *dual* group algebra.

For an algebra A , let

$$\mu(A) = \#\text{inequivalent simple } A\text{-modules of dimension coprime to } p. \quad (1)$$

We say that a pair of algebras (A, B) is an *M-pair* in case $\mu(A) = \mu(B)$. The McKay Conjecture (MC) is the assertion that $(\mathbb{C}[G], \mathbb{C}[N])$ is an M-pair. The reader may consult the paper [IMN] of Isaacs, Malle and Navarro for the current status of

*Supported by grants from the NSF, NSA, and faculty research funds granted by the University of California at Santa Cruz.

this conjecture. The idea of the present paper is to *extend* MC beyond its original formulation for groups. First we show how it may be extended to large classes of algebras that are not group algebras. Examples include *crossed product* algebras, where we show that $(\mathbb{C}[H]^* \#_{\sigma} \mathbb{C}[G], \mathbb{C}[H]^* \#_{\sigma} \mathbb{C}[N])$ is an M-pair. Here, G acts on the group H and σ is a certain 2-cocycle. (See [Mo], [KMM] for background.) A particularly interesting case is that of quantum doubles $D(G)$ (see [D], [M1] and below for more details). In this case we establish

MC is true if, and only if, $(D(G), D(N))$ is an M-pair for all G and N .

Note that quantum doubles $D(G)$ are generally not group algebras (unless G is abelian).

For a multiplicative 3-cocycle $\omega \in Z^3(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$, we show that MC implies the same result for *twisted quantum doubles*. That is, $(D^{\omega}(G), D^{\omega}(N))$ is an M-pair. Now there is a standard Ansatz in orbifold conformal field theory (CFT) due to Dijkgraaf-Pasquier-Roche [DPR] which, when interpreted appropriately, says that the tensor category $D^{\omega}(G)\text{-Mod}$ is equivalent to the module category $V^G\text{-Mod}$ of a so-called holomorphic G -orbifold for a suitable vertex operator algebra V admitting G as automorphisms. Therefore, granted the DPR conjecture, MC is *equivalent* to a CFT-formulation involving a bijection between certain sets of simple modules for V^G and V^N . It is not necessary for the reader to be familiar with this language; the point is simply that modules for V^G are infinite-dimensional and the idea of an M-pair based on definition (1) makes no sense. In fact, all three types of M-pairs that we have discussed (i.e. for groups, (quasi-)Hopf algebras and orbifolds) may be uniformly described in the following setting: a pair of ribbon categories admitting a bijection between objects whose quantum dimension is integral and coprime to p .

All of the proofs in this paper are elementary and involve nothing beyond a few facts about finite groups, their representations, and their cohomology. In Section 2 we discuss some algebras $D_X(G)$ constructed from G and a G -set X and show that MC implies that $(D_X(G), D_X(N))$ is an M-pair. We also establish (2). In Section 3 we carry out the twisted analog of this construction. Together, these results cover several of the connections with crossed products and twisted quantum doubles mentioned above. In Section 4 we discuss the connections with CFT and ribbon categories. We assure the reader that no knowledge of CFT is required to understand the contents of this paper.

We thank Siu-Hung Ng, Robert Boltje and Gabriel Navarro for their interest and comments on earlier versions of this paper.

2 The algebras $D_X(G)$

We use the following additional notation: for $H \leq G, g \in G, H^g = \{g^{-1}hg \mid h \in H\}$. For $x \in X$, $\text{Stab}_G(x) = \{g \in G \mid g.x = x\}$.

We now introduce the algebras $D_X(G)$, which were mentioned briefly in [M1]. Let $\mathbb{C}[X]^*$ be the space of complex-valued functions on X . One sees that it is a G -module

algebra, as follows. The algebra structure is pointwise multiplication, with basis the Dirac delta functions

$$e(x) : y \mapsto \delta_{x,y} \quad x, y \in X.$$

Thus

$$e(x)e(y) = \delta_{x,y}e(x).$$

G acts on the left of $\mathbb{C}[X]^*$ as algebra automorphisms via

$$g : e(x) \mapsto e(g.x).$$

Consider the linear space

$$D_X(G) = \mathbb{C}[X]^* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[G]. \quad (2)$$

It becomes an algebra via the product

$$\begin{aligned} (e(x) \otimes g)(e(y) \otimes h) &= e(x)e(g.y) \otimes gh \\ &= \delta_{x,g.y}e(x) \otimes gh \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for $x, y \in X$ and $g, h \in G$. One readily checks that this is *associative*. There is a decomposition into 2-sided ideals

$$D_X(G) = \bigoplus_Y D_Y(G) \quad (4)$$

where Y ranges over the (transitive) G -orbits of X . For the most part, this reduces questions about $D_X(G)$ for general X to the transitive case.

A special example of this construction is the quantum double of G . Here, we take $X = G_{conj}$, i.e. $X = G$ and the left action of G is left conjugation $g : x \mapsto gxg^{-1}$. In this case we write $D(G)$ in place of $D_{G_{conj}}(G)$. $D(G)$ is in fact a Hopf algebra, but at the moment we only require the algebra structure.

Next we describe the category of (left-) $D_X(G)$ -modules (cf. [DPR], [M1], [KMM]). For $x \in X$ and a left $\text{Stab}_G(x)$ -module V , set $V_x = e(x) \otimes V$. This is a left $\mathbb{C}[X]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)$ -module via

$$(e(y) \otimes g).(e(x) \otimes v) = e(y)e(x) \otimes g.v = \delta_{x,y}e(x) \otimes g.v, \quad g \in \text{Stab}_G(x). \quad (5)$$

From (3) it follows that $\mathbb{C}[X]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)$ is a left ideal in $D_X(G)$, so that $D_X(G) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[X]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)} V_x$ is a left $D_X(G)$ -module.

Proposition 2.1 *Suppose that X is a transitive G -set and $x \in X$. Then the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}[\text{Stab}_G(x)]\text{-Mod} &\rightarrow D_X(G)\text{-Mod}, \\ V &\mapsto D_X(G) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[X]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)} V_x, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

is a Morita equivalence.

Proof: For this and more, see [M1] and Section 3 of [KMM]. In these references X is a group, but this is not necessary and the proofs to go through without change. $\square$

Proposition 2.2 *Suppose that X is a transitive G -set and $x \in X$. The following hold:*

- (a) *If p does not divide $|X|$ then $(D_X(G), \text{Stab}_G(x))$ is an M -pair.*
- (b) *If p divides $|X|$ then $\mu(D_X(G)) = 0$.*

Proof: By Proposition 2.1 and (6), the simple left $D_X(G)$ -modules are precisely the modules $D_X(G) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[G]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)} V_x$ as V ranges over the simple left modules for $\text{Stab}_G(x)$.

Let T be a set of right coset representatives in G for $\text{Stab}_G(x)$, so that there is a disjoint union $G = \cup_{t \in T} t \text{Stab}_G(x)$. If $t \in T, s \in \text{Stab}_G(x)$ and $y \in X$ then $e(y) \otimes ts = (e(y) \otimes t)(e(t^{-1}.y) \otimes s)$. Using (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_X(G) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[G]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)} V_x &= \sum_{s, t, y} (e(y) \otimes t)(e(t^{-1}.y) \otimes s) e(x) \otimes V \\ &= \sum_{t, y} \delta_{x, t^{-1}.y} (e(y) \otimes t) e(x) \otimes V \\ &= \sum_t (e(t.x) \otimes t) e(x) \otimes V, \end{aligned}$$

the last sum being a *direct sum*. Because X is transitive, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(D_X(G) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[G]^* \otimes \text{Stab}_G(x)} V_x) &= |T| \dim V \\ &= |X| \dim V. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that in the Morita equivalence (6), modules of dimension d are mapped to modules of dimension $d|X|$. Parts (a) and (b) follow immediately from this. $\square$

Lemma 2.3 $\mu(D_X(G)) = \sum_Y \mu(D_Y(G))$ where Y ranges over the G -orbits of X .

Proof: This follows from the decomposition (4) into 2-sided ideals. $\square$

We will also need the following standard result.

Lemma 2.4 *The number of G -orbits of X of cardinality coprime to p is equal to the number of N -orbits of X of cardinality coprime to p .*

Proof: By considering the decomposition of X into G -orbits, we see that we must prove the following assertion:

- If X is a *transitive* G -set, then either (a) p divides $|X|$ and N has *no* orbits of cardinality coprime to p , or (b) p does *not* divide $|X|$ and there is a *unique* N -orbit of cardinality coprime to p . (7)

Assume, then, that X is a transitive G -set, and that $x, y \in X$ lie in N -orbits of cardinality coprime to p . In such an N -orbit, P must fix at least one, and therefore all, elements in the N -orbit. In particular, P lies in the stabilizers of both x and y . By transitivity there is $g \in G$ with $g.x = y$. Then P and P^g are both Sylow p -subgroups of $\text{Stab}_G(x)$ and by Sylow's theorem there is $t \in \text{Stab}_G(x)$ such that $P^{gt} = P$. Then $gt \in N$ and $(gt).x = y$. This shows that x, y lie in the *same* N -orbit, so that there is at most one N -orbit of cardinality coprime to p . (7) is easily deduced from this, and the Lemma is proved. $\square$

Consider the following statements:

MC1 : $(\mathbb{C}[G], \mathbb{C}[N])$ is an M-pair for all G ,

MCD : $(D(G), D(N))$ is an M-pair for all G ,

MCX : $(D_X(G), D_X(N))$ is an M-pair for all G and all X ,

MCT : $(D_X(G), D_X(N))$ is an M-pair for all G and all *transitive* X .

The McKay Conjecture is of course the assertion that MC1 is true.

Theorem 2.5 *MC1, MCD, MCX and MCT are equivalent statements.*

Proof: $MCX \Leftrightarrow MCT$: This follows from Lemma 2.4.

$MCT \Rightarrow MC1$: This holds because if $X = \mathbf{1}$ is the one-element set, then $D_X(G) = \mathbb{C}[G]$.

$MC1 \Rightarrow MCT$: Let X be a transitive G -set. If p divides $|X|$ then $\mu(D_X(G)) = 0$ by Proposition 2.2(b). Similarly, $\mu(D_X(N)) = 0$ by Lemma 2.3, (7)(a), and Proposition 2.2(b) (applied to N). Now suppose that p does *not* divide $|X|$. Then $\mu(D_X(G)) = \mu(\mathbb{C}[\text{Stab}_G(x)])$ for any $x \in X$ by Proposition 2.2(a). Moreover by Lemma 2.4 there is a *unique* N -orbit of cardinality coprime to p , call it $Y \subseteq X$. By Lemmas 2.3, (7) and Proposition 2.2 once more we find that $\mu(D_X(N)) = \mu(D_Y(N)) = \mu(\mathbb{C}[\text{Stab}_N(y)])$ for $y \in Y$. Note that because $|Y|$ is coprime to p then $P \leq \text{Stab}_G(y)$ and $N_{\text{Stab}_G(y)}(P) = \text{Stab}_N(y)$. The assumption that MC1 holds (applied to $\text{Stab}_G(y)$) tells us that $\mu(\mathbb{C}[\text{Stab}_G(y)]) = \mu(\mathbb{C}[\text{Stab}_N(y)])$, whence $\mu(D_X(G)) = \mu(D_X(N))$.

$MCX \Rightarrow MCD$: Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_h$ be the N -orbits of G_{conj} of cardinality coprime to p . We have $Y_i \subseteq N$ for each index i , so that they are also the N -orbits of N_{conj} of cardinality coprime to p . Taking $X = G_{conj}$, MCX together with Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.2, we conclude that $\mu(D(G)) = \mu(D_{G_{conj}}(N)) = \sum_{i=1}^h \mu(D_{Y_i}(N)) = \mu(D_{N_{conj}}(N)) = \mu(D(N))$, as required.

$MCD \Rightarrow MC1$: We prove this using induction on $|G|$. Retain the notation of the last paragraph, and choose $y_i \in Y_i$. By Lemma 2.4, $y_1, \dots, y_h$ are representatives for the G -orbits of G_{conj} (ie. conjugacy classes of G) of cardinality coprime to p . By Proposition 2.2, $\mu(D(G)) = \sum_{i=1}^h \mu(\mathbb{C}[C_G(y_i)])$. Since each $y_i \in N$, we similarly have $\mu(D(N)) = \sum_{i=1}^h \mu(\mathbb{C}[C_N(y_i)])$. If $C_G(y_i)$ is a *proper* subgroup of G then by induction $\mu(\mathbb{C}[C_G(y_i)]) = \mu(\mathbb{C}[C_N(y_i)])$. Then the assumption MCD tells us that $\sum_{i'} \mu(\mathbb{C}[G]) = \sum_{i'} \mu(\mathbb{C}[N])$ where i' ranges over those indices for which $y_{i'}$ lies in the center $Z(G)$ of G . We conclude that $|Z(G)|\mu(\mathbb{C}[G]) = |Z(G)|\mu(\mathbb{C}[N])$, whence $\mu(\mathbb{C}[G]) = \mu(\mathbb{C}[N])$. This completes the proof of the Theorem. $\square$

3 Twisted Algebras

In this Section we explain how to extend the results of the previous Section to the *twisted case*, i.e. the incorporation of a cocycle. Let $\theta \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$ be a (normalized) multiplicative 2-cocycle. Thus $\theta : G^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ satisfies the identities

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(h, k)\theta(g, hk) &= \theta(gh, k)\theta(g, h), \quad g, h, k \in G, \\ \theta(1, g) &= \theta(g, 1) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding twisted group algebra is $\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]$. It has the same underlying linear space as $\mathbb{C}[G]$ with multiplication $g \circ h = \theta(g, h)gh$ for $g, h \in G$. The cocycle identities ensure that this is an associative algebra with identity element 1. For a subgroup $H \leq G$ we identify θ with its *restriction* $\text{Res}_H^G \theta$ to H . Then $\mathbb{C}^\theta[H]$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]$. For more information on this subject, including results that we use below, see for example [CR].

The cohomological analog of Proposition 2.2(b) is the following

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that the cohomology class $[\theta] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$ determined by θ has order k . If k is divisible by p then $\mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]) = \mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[N]) = 0$.*

Proof: One knows (loc. cit.) that there is a central extension

$$1 \rightarrow Z \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{\pi} G \rightarrow 1$$

such that $\mathbb{Z}_k \cong Z \leq L'$, and $\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]$ is the algebra summand of $\mathbb{C}[L]$ corresponding to the irreducible representations of L in which a generator z of Z acts as multiplication by a prescribed primitive k th. root of unity, say λ . If V is a simple $\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]$ -module of dimension d then the determinant of z considered as operator on V is clearly λ^d . On the other hand $z \in L'$, so that this determinant is necessarily 1. So $\lambda^d = 1$, whence $k|d$. In particular, if $p|k$ then $\mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]) = 0$.

Now it is well-known that the restriction map $\text{Res}_N^G : H^2(G, \mathbb{C}^*) \rightarrow H^2(N, \mathbb{C}^*)$ is an *injection* on the p -part of $H^2(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$. In particular, if $p|k$ then $\text{Res}_N^G[\theta]$ has divisible by p . Then the result of the last paragraph also applies to $\mathbb{C}^\theta[N]$, and we obtain $\mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[N]) = 0$. This completes the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

The McKay Conjecture implies that the twisted analog is also true. This is the content of

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose that MC1 holds. Then $(\mathbb{C}^\theta[G], \mathbb{C}^\theta[N])$ is an M -pair for all G and all θ .*

Proof: Let the notation be as in Lemma 3.1. Although it is not really necessary to do so, because of Lemma 3.1 we may, and shall, assume that k is not divisible by p . Let P_1 be a Sylow p -subgroup of L with $\pi : P_1 \xrightarrow{\cong} P$. Applying MC1 to pairs $(L/Z_0, N_L(P_1)/Z_0)$ with $Z_0 \leq Z$, we see that the number l of irreducible representations of both $\mathbb{C}[L]$ and $\mathbb{C}[N_L(P_1)]$ which have degree coprime to p and in which

z acts as *some* primitive k th. root of unity are equal. Since $\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]$ is the algebra summand of $\mathbb{C}[L]$ corresponding to λ , then $\mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[G]) = l/\phi(k)$. On the other hand, $N_L(P_1) = ZK$ where $K \leq L$ is such that $\mathbb{C}^\theta[N]$ is the algebra summand of $\mathbb{C}[K]$ corresponding to λ^t , where $t|k$ and k/t is the order of $\text{Res}_N^G[\theta]$. By slightly modifying the previous argument, we also find that $\mu(\mathbb{C}^\theta[N]) = l/\phi(k)$, and the Proposition is proved. $\square$

We can now treat the twisted version of $D_X(G)$. Let $U = U(\mathbb{C}[X]^*)$ be the group of units in $\mathbb{C}[X]^*$. Then

$$U = \left\{ \sum \lambda_x e(x) \mid \lambda_x \neq 0 \right\}$$

is a *multiplicative* left G -module. Let $\alpha \in Z^2(G, U)$ be a normalized 2-cocycle with coefficients in U , and set $\alpha(g, h) = \sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x(g, h) e(x)$. Here, the cocycle property amounts to the identity

$$\alpha_x(g, h) \alpha_x(gh, k) = \alpha_x(g, hk) \alpha_{g^{-1} \cdot x}(h, k). \quad (8)$$

Define $D_X^\alpha(G)$ to be the linear space $D_X(G)$ with multiplication being the twisted version of (3). That is,

$$(e(x) \otimes g)(e(y) \otimes h) = \alpha_x(g, h) \delta_{x, g \cdot y} e(x) \otimes gh. \quad (9)$$

(8) is exactly what is needed to show that (9) is *associative*. Note also from (8) that for fixed $x \in X$, α_x defines an element in $Z^2(\text{Stab}_G(x), \mathbb{C}^*)$ and that as a subspace of $D_X^\alpha(G)$, $S(x) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_x}[\text{Stab}_G(x)]$. The proof of Proposition 2.1 still applies in this situation (cf. [KMM]). It provides a Morita equivalence of categories

$$\mathbb{C}^{\alpha_x}[\text{Stab}_G(x)]\text{-Mod} \xrightarrow{\sim} D_X^\alpha(G)\text{-Mod}.$$

The proof of the twisted version of Theorem 2.5 then goes through too. We just state a part of this as

Theorem 3.3 *Suppose that MC1 holds. Then $(D_X^\alpha(G), (D_X^\alpha(N)))$ is an M -pair for all G, X and α . $\square$*

Special cases of $D_X^\alpha(G)$ include certain kinds of crossed products and abelian extensions of Hopf algebras. See, for example, [KMM] for further details.

Once again the case of the quantum double, when $X = G_{\text{conj}}$, is of special interest (cf. [CK], [DM], [DPR], [M1] for more details and further background.) Here, one twists $D(G)$ by a normalized *three cocycle* $\omega \in Z^3(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$. The resulting object is denoted by $D^\omega(G)$. It is a quasi-Hopf algebra, but not a Hopf algebra in general. To connect with previous paragraphs, we observe that there is a map ([DPR])

$$Z^3(G, \mathbb{C}^*) \rightarrow Z^2(G, G_{\text{conj}})$$

for which

$$\alpha_x(g, h) = \frac{\omega(x, g, h)\omega(g, h, (gh)^{-1}x(gh))}{\omega(g, g^{-1}xg, h)}. \quad (10)$$

There is a natural interpretation of this map in terms of the loop space LBG , but we will not need it. The twisted product in $D^\omega(G)$ is as in (9) using (10). This gives the algebra structure, and as before leads to

Theorem 3.4 *Suppose that MC1 holds. Then $(D^\omega(G), D^\omega(N))$ is an M-pair for all G and ω . $\square$*

The statement and proof of Theorem 3.4 only requires the algebra structure of $D^\omega(G)$. However, we will make use of other structural features of $D^\omega(G)$ in the next Section.

4 Orbifolds and Ribbon Categories

We refer the interested reader to [DM] for background concerning vertex operator algebras. Let V be a holomorphic vertex operator algebra admitting G as a group of automorphisms, with V^G the subalgebra of G -invariants. One expects that the module category $V^G\text{-Mod}$ is a (braided, ribbon) tensor category and that it is equivalent to the tensor category $D^\omega(G)\text{-Mod}$ for a 3-cocycle ω which describes the associativity constraint in $V^G\text{-Mod}$. If this is so, we deduce from Theorem 3.4 that there are bijections between the simple objects of $V^G\text{-Mod}$ and $V^N\text{-Mod}$ which themselves correspond to the simple modules of $D^\omega(G)\text{-Mod}$ and $D^\omega(N)\text{-Mod}$ respectively which have dimension coprime to p .

We seek a direct definition of an M-pair for modules over orbifolds such as V^G and V^N . We cannot use (1) as it stands because it makes no sense for infinite-dimensional spaces such as a module over a vertex operator algebra. Instead, we can make use of the expected structure of $V^G\text{-Mod}$ as a ribbon tensor category, whereby the objects have a *quantum dimension*. Indeed, $D^\omega(G)\text{-Mod}$ has a *canonical* ribbon structure (cf. [AC], [MN]), and the quantum dimensions of simple objects are the usual dimensions. Granted the equivalence of $V^G\text{-Mod}$ and $D^\omega(G)\text{-Mod}$, it follows that the quantum dimension of simple objects in $V^G\text{-Mod}$ are also integers. Then the definition of an M-pair makes sense if we use quantum dimension in place of dimension.

Thus we arrive at the following situation: a pair of ribbon fusion categories $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{N}$ whose simple objects have quantum dimensions that are rational integers. We say that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{N})$ is an M-pair if $\mu(\mathcal{G}) = \mu(\mathcal{N})$, where we use (1) with quantum dimension in place of dimension in order to define μ . As we have seen, taking $\mathcal{G}$ to be $\mathbb{C}[G]\text{-Mod}$, $D^\omega(G)\text{-Mod}$ or $V^G\text{-Mod}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ to be $\mathbb{C}[N]\text{-Mod}$, $D^\omega(N)\text{-Mod}$ or $V^N\text{-Mod}$ respectively results (conjecturally) in an M-pair. Furthermore, the three versions of MC for groups, quantum doubles of groups, and holomorphic orbifolds, are *equivalent*.

References

- [AC] D. Altschuler and A. Coste, Quasi-quantum groups, knots, three-manifolds, and topological field theory, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 150(1) (1992), 83-107.
- [CK] C. Kassel, *Quantum Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 155, Springer, New York, 1995.
- [CR] C. Curtis and I. Reiner, *Methods of Representation Theory Vol. 1*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1981.
- [D] V. Drinfeld, Quasi-Hopf algebras, *Leningrad Math. J.* 1 (1990), 1419-1457.
- [DM] C. Dong and G. Mason, Vertex Operator Algebras and Moonshine: A survey, in *Adv. Studies in Pure Math.* 24, *Progress in Algebraic Combinatorics*, Math. Soc. of Japan, Tokyo, (1996), 101-136.
- [DPR] R. Dijkgraaf, V. Pasquier, and P. Roche, Quasi-quantum groups related to orbifold models, in *Modern quantum field theory (Bombay, 1990)*, World Scientific (1991), 375-383.
- [IMN] M. Isaacs, G. Malle, and G. Navarro, A reduction theorem for the McKay conjecture, *Inv. Math.* 170 (2007), 33-101.
- [KMM] Y. Kashina, G. Mason, and S. Montgomery, Computing the Frobenius-Schur Indicator for Abelian Extensions of Hopf Algebras, *J. Alg* **251** (2002), 888-913.
- [M1] G. Mason, The quantum double of a finite group and its role in conformal field theory, in *Groups '93 Galway/.St. Andrews Vol. 2*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Notes Ser. 212, CUP, 1995.
- [MN] G. Mason and S-H. Ng, Central invariants and Frobenius-Schur indicators for semi-simple quasi-Hopf algebras, *Adv. Math.* 190 (2005), 161-195.
- [Mo] S. Montgomery, *Hopf Algebras and Their Actions on Rings*, CBMS Number 82, Amer. Math. Soc., 1993.